G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references.

1921.

File No.

(Mucz)

Serial No

Later references.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos.

Part B for Nov 21

SUBJECT.

Petn from Khadri Lakshmikantha Shetty of Sidlaghatta requesting to reconsider the order passed by Govt re the management of the Kayarupitta Hanumanahalli village endowed to the Sri Anjaneyaswamy temple

Petn no 2576 dy 18 11 21

declining to reconsider the

WD 1888—GPB—16,826—23-7 21

G. R. S. 11] 1921.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(Inzrai)

NOTES.

File No. 194 - 21

FILE HEADING

Inaugement of Kayanishta Hanumanahalli Village in the Siddaghatta Taluk endowed to Sri Anjaneya Swami Temple.

From

Khadri Seshacharlu,

No. Petition Dated 30-8-21 Received 1.9.21.

Diary No.	Enclos	Spare Copies	Serial No.
428	—	—	1

BRIEF ABSTRACT OF LETTER.

Prays that as the Temple was constructed by his father, and as he has rendering service in it, the said village which has been placed in the possession of the lessee Venkatachamanappa, may be restored to his

NOTES AND ORDERS.

possession

The petition is duly stamped, but a copy of the order appealed against, has not been produced. A letter calling for a copy, to which the appeal

30.9.21.

3/9/21

It is an appeal R.P., it may be rejected for want of the order appealed against according to

NOTES—First Sheet.

G. R. S. III-21

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 194 of 1921.

Serial No.	
	the rules in force on the subject. Rapt-Supdt asking for orders appealed against is also put up for orders BG 3/9/21
	The petitioner may be informed that the matter has already been disposed of by him, he may refer to the orders passed by him. BG 8/9/21
	Offr. Enclosed BG 9.9.21 BG 9.9.21 Issue 10/9/21
2	To, The Kolar. Orr. 1623 dt 22.9.21 Forwarded for disposal & returned that in case the matter has already been disposed of by him action such action may be sent to us for information

NOTE—Contn. sheet

G. R. S. 111-21

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 194 of 1911.

Serial No.	
3	From, the Dy Comr, Kolar Dist., Letter no. 139 Dy 9.10 Reports that on a perusal of the Dy. Comr's previous report no. 6275/208 Dy 8-3-1910, Govt have rejected the petition of Khaddi Seshachar in Govt no. 3077 (mis. 306-0) Dy 31-5-11. Attention is respectfully invited to the Dy. Comr's reports Dy 7th March 10, and 11th May 1911 giving a full account of the facts of the case. In Govt no 3077/306-0 Dy 31-5-11 rejecting the review application of Khaddi Seshachar, Govt have declined to re-consider the previous order of Govt directing that Godi Ramanahalli Village, be left in the hands of the heirs of the late Ramaswamaiah Venkatanarayanaiah. A reconsideration of this order is now sought for, and no fresh grounds have been urged. Submit. Orders 5-11-11. 5/11/11

NOTE—Contn. sheet

G. R. S. III-2.

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 194 of 1921

Serial No

The petition may be regarded
Second Member) 12/11/21

2195-17

approved
Rees
11-11-21

Draft ord[er] submitted
12.11.21 12/11/21
Second Member

2855-317

Disapproved
Rees
16.11.21

Secretary
7/11/21

4 To, Khaja Sofia Chan of Hammamabad
No. 2516 dt 18 11 1921
declining to reconsider the orders of Govt.
already passed in the matter
No. 2517 - To, Haji Ghulam Rasul
Forwards a copy of the above

15

NOTE—Contn sheet

EIGHT ANNAS

GEN & REV. SECT.
9 AUG

The Secretary,

to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore

MUZARAI DEPARTMENT, BANGALORE.

429

Respected Sir,

With due respects and humble submission I beg to bring the following few lines for your kind and favourable considera-tion:--

2. Kayamgutta Hanumenahally Village in the Siddaghatta Taluk was gifted by my father to SRI ANJANEYASWAMY TEMPLE in the Village and was endowed by Government as DEVADAYA for the up-keep of the said Institution. It has not been enfranchised.

3. As the village is a re-populated one and as there was not sufficient income for the maintenance of the temple, I was obliged to lease out, about the year 1884, two-thirds of the village for an annual rent of Rs23/- in favour of Muttoor Venkataramanappa and two others.

4. The temple was constructed by my father and I was rendering service in the temple, which has been recognised by Government.

5. After the leasing out of the village, and during my temporary absence, the Lessee Venkataramanappa not only cut and removed the valuable trees in the village but also used the temple stones for his private purposes, leaving the temple in a dilapidated state. I complained the matter to the Authorities, but in the enquiry, during my absence, the Government, on the mis-representations of the Lessee Venkataramanappa that the village was purchased by him and that I had no right in it, directed that the said village may be restored to him, on condition of his repairing the temple, at a cost of about Rs300/- estimated by the said Authorities. The Lessee accordingly restored the temple and took possession of the village.


ONE RUPEE


ONE RUPEE

6. As represented by Venkataramanappa, the fact of his having purchased the village is false. Besides the village is not subject to alienation, as it is DEVADAYA and un-enfranchised one.

7. Regarding the repairs executed by the Lessee to the temple, I beg to bring to your kind notice that he has not spent any money of his own, but he has utilised the accumulated Gutta amount and the sale proceeds of the valuable trees referred to above, though it was binding on him to repair it at his own cost, since he has removed the temple stones for his private use and left it in a dilapidated state.

8. I have been petitioning in this matter to all the authorities from a long time. I regret that no action was taken till now.

9. Under the above circumstances, I beg to submit that the matter may kindly be enquired into and the village restored to my possession for the due performance of PUJA in the temple, in accordance with the conditions of the grant.

For which act of kindness I shall ever pray for your long life and prosperity.

I beg to remain,

Pespected Sir;

Your most obedient servant,

dated

The petition is returned as it is not sufficiently stamped

By order

Bangalore
15th August 21

Regd Post

1:8151

GEN & REV SECTT

Respectfully Submitted

I beg to State that I have

duly affixed Stamps to the

Value of two Rupees and resubmitted

the Same for begine Consideration

823

a.v. 20-10-97 [illegible]

[illegible]

1/9/97

G. R. S. VI—G/32]

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

*Diary No. of letter replied to*_____

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

, the *191*

Date of issue 22-7-21

Signed by Mr. T E J [illegible]

Section Imp. II

File No. 194-4

Serial No. 2

No. 1623 Revenue

To The Dy Commr,
Kolar Dist,

Sir,

I am directed to forward herewith for favour of disposal petition regd. on 198 from Khadri Secretary praying that Kayamgutta Hemmanenahalli Village in the Hoskote Taluk may be transferred to the Bangalore District now

been placed in the Possession
of the Lords Commissioners
of Admiralty, has, in virtue
of his previous and
present Trust of the Matters
has already been disposed
of by you, given rise
to [illegible]
Yours &c
Thos Hardy

Copied by

Examined by

List of enclosures.

12459 1457

From [illegible] 20 21.

[illegible]

184 - 21

To 3

[illegible]

Dated [illegible]

Despatched 9 . 10 . 21

Received

General No. HC 134

No. 21 - 22

By Regt Post

Enclosure No. File 1 a petition

[illegible]

Kega Post

Lt. C 139/21-22 encl file ka petition
8 9-10-21

Office of the Deputy Commissioner, Kolar District.
Kolar, the 6th October 1921.

From

M. Venkatalingaiengar, Regr., B.A., B.L.,
Deputy Commissioner, Kolar District.

To

The Hon'ble Lt. Col. J. A. Graham, C.I.E.,
Secretary to Government of Mysore,
Political Department,
Bangalore.

Sir,

I have the honour to forward herewith a petition dated 3/4-10-21, addressed to the Viceroy, through the Resident, Bangalore, by Sri Hanumenahalli Venkatappa, a ryot of Kolar, praying that he may be restored to the Patelship of Hanumenahalli (Kolar Taluk) from which he was dismissed in 1907, on the ground that the charges on which he was dismissed were false and that he was not given an opportunity to defend himself.

The petitioner was dismissed from the Patelship in 1907 and has been living in Kolar since then. He has now applied for restoration to the Patelship.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,
M. Venkatalingaiengar
Deputy Commissioner,
Kolar Dist.
(Political Agent.)

RVB

G. R. S. VI—G/32]

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

Diary No. of letter replied to——————

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *191* .

Date of issue 18-11-24.

Signed by ——————

Section

File No.

Serial No.

No. 2516

To